

Appl. No. 10/750,025
Amdt. Dated June 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 12 are objected to because of minor informalities as follows. In claim 1, line 10, "brightnesses" should be changed to brightness. Brightness has no plural form. In claim 12, line 8, "the secondary feedback circuit" lacks antecedent basis.

In response to these objections, applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 accordingly. Applicant has changed brightnesses to brightness in amended claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 12, which now recites "...at least one secondary sub-system including a secondary driving circuit..., and a secondary feedback circuit connected in series; wherein the primary feedback circuit is linked to the secondary feedback circuit." In amended claim 12, "the secondary feedback circuit" has antecedent basis.

Claims 1 and 12 have also been amended in respect of other minor informalities. Applicant requests that the objections to claims 1 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, as follows. Regarding each of claims 12 and 13, "one another in series" is vague because "one another" does not certainly

Appl. No. 10/750,025
Amdt. Dated June 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

point out the limitation.

In response to these rejections, applicant has amended each of claims 12 and 13 by deleting "to one another" therefrom. It is submitted that the claim language delineating the structure is now clear, and that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smelker (6,207,943).

In response to this rejection, applicant submits that amended claim 12 is allowable over Smelker and all of the other cited references, as follows:

Amended claim 12 recites in part:

An illumination system, comprising a primary sub-system including a primary feedback circuit,...and at least one secondary sub-system including a secondary feedback circuit...wherein the primary feedback circuit is linked to the secondary feedback circuit.

Applicant submits that Smelker does not teach, disclose, or otherwise suggest the invention as currently recited in amended claim 12.

Smelker does disclose a consistent brightness backlight system which includes an optical sensing circuit, a comparator circuit, a controller, and an

Appl. No. 10/750,025

Amdt. Dated June 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

inverter dimmer circuit...(see abstract). However, Smelker does not disclose or suggest any secondary sub-system including a secondary feedback circuit connected to the primary feedback circuit. Accordingly, Smelker clearly fails to teach or suggest the illumination system as recited in amended claim 12.

Moreover, Smelker discloses a backlight system including the circuits for extending the life of a light source such as a CCFL. That is, as brightness reduces with the passing of time, the power that is supplied to the light source is gradually increased. However, the illumination system recited in amended claim 12 ensures that each light tube has the same brightness, even when all the light tubes are new. This difference demonstrates that Smelker does not teach forming an illumination system comprising all the limitations recited in amended claim 12.

In summary, there is nothing in the cited reference that teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they might or should provide the illumination system of amended claim 12. Furthermore, the illumination system as recited in amended claim 12 produces new and unexpected results. That is, in use, each light tube thereof has the same brightness.

Accordingly, amended claim 12 is submitted to be novel, unobvious and patentable over Smelker under both s.102(b) and s.103. Further, applicant submits that neither Smelker nor any of the other references mentioned by Examiner in the Office action under the heading Conclusion, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or otherwise suggests the invention as currently recited in amended claim 12. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 12 are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/750,025
Amdt. Dated June 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant has amended claim 13, as detailed above, and requests allowance of the claim accordingly.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jyh Chain Lin

By 

Wei Fe Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137